

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are all the claims pending in the application.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0191802; hereinafter “Zhao”), in view of Oki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,969; hereinafter “Oki”), further in view of Reisman (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,054).

Analysis of Claim Rejections

As noted above, claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao in view of Oki, further in view of Reisman. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Zhao is directed toward servicing service requests that are requested by service users, such as home devices. Zhao discloses that the home devices are also considered service providers (paragraph 43 and 45). All internal services, such as services provided by home devices, are registered in a local UDDI registry, which is compatible with a public UDDI registry such as those from IBM and Microsoft (paragraph 48). When a service request by a service user is made, a database which contains a list of service providers is searched, and the service user selects at least one of the results of the search (paragraphs 48 and 50).

Oki is directed toward “a remote installation system and method for enabling a user to obtain any software through a communication line and automatically install it” (abstract). Specifically, Oki discloses that the list of software is displayed on the screen of a display from which a user selects an intended software and inputs it into a terminal, where the selected software is sent to a host computer (col. 7, lines 40-50).

In response to our Amendment filed June 3, 2008, the Examiner acknowledges that neither Zhao nor Oki, teach or suggest the claimed feature of “wherein said list of registered applications is automatically requested at a predetermined interval, by a service agent”, as recited in claim 1. Instead, the Examiner relies on newly cited prior art by Reisman as allegedly disclosing this claimed feature.

Reisman is directed toward mass distribution of electronic information products (col. 5, lines 15-17). Specifically, Reisman discloses “providing a distribution service that distributes updates for a plurality of different **products**” (col. 5, lines 22-24; emphasis added). Reisman merely discloses updating “products” where the products have already been fetched to a user station. For example, Reisman discloses examples of products such as “magazines and periodicals, software applications and utilities, video games, business, legal and financial information and databases, encyclopedias and dictionaries” (col. 1, lines 35-39). Reisman further discloses that “[where] updates are made available on a known schedule, a totally automated product can be provided that fetches an update without any user intervention, on the specified release date” (col. 8, line 50 - col. 9, line 16). That is, Reisman discloses a product that fetches updates for itself without user intervention on a periodic basis or schedule.

In contrast, the claimed invention recites that a “list of registered applications” is automatically requested where an application is selected from the list. That is, the claimed “list of registered applications” are not merely a set of updates for already existing applications, but instead is a list of all applications provided by a plurality of service developers for a client device on an intranet, as recited in claim 1. Clearly, Reisman merely discloses the fetching of updates, and fails to teach or suggest at least the above claimed feature. Furthermore, as noted above, Reisman discloses that the product itself fetches the update. However, the claimed invention

recites that the list of registered applications is requested by a service agent, and not by an application or client device.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Independent claims 5, 8, 14, 18 and 22 recite one or more features analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 5, 8, 14, 18 and 22 are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-13, 15-17, 19-21 and 23-25 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1, 5, 8, 14, 18 and 22, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter A. McKenna
Registration No. 38,551

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 5, 2009